

**REMARKS**

In a first Office Action dated January 21, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-38 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for adding new matter. The Examiner further rejected claims 1-38 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Frailong et al. (U.S. patent no. 6,012,100, hereinafter referred to as "Frailong"). The rejections are traversed and reconsideration is hereby respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-38 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for adding new matter. Specifically, the Examiner contended that the claimed "peer level service delivery" is not disclosed in the specification, stating that there is no mention in the specification of the service delivery element being a peer level. The applicants have amended the claims to delete referenced to a "peer level service delivery." Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of the claims under §112, second paragraph.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-38 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Frailong. Claim 1 has been amended to provide a service delivery element (SDE) for interfacing a feature server to a communication network, wherein the feature server is external to the network and wherein the SDE negotiates a security level between the feature server and the network and manages access by the feature server to the communication network. The SDE thereby expands services available to a subscriber, such as an end user's computer, via the communication network.

By contrast, Frailong teaches an interface for connecting a subscriber him-or-herself, for example, a subscriber/client computer or a client computer system, to the Internet and more particularly for enabling the subscriber/client system to obtain a transport service for access to the Internet (see col. 2, lines 16-21). That is, Frailong merely teaches a configuring of a subscriber/client interface, that is, a subscriber/client gateway, to the Internet. In contrast to Frailong, claim 1 is concerned with an interface between a network and an SDE that the subscriber wants to access via the network. Claim 1 teaches a controlling of the interface between the feature server and the network by use of an SDE, thereby enabling a securing of the interface between the network and

the feature server. Thus the teachings of Frailong and claim 1 are concerned with interfaces at opposite ends of a network that couples a client to an external element.

Therefore, the applicants respectfully submit that the SDE of claim 1 for interfacing a feature server to a communication network is not taught by Frailong. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that claim 1 may now be passed to allowance.

Since claims 2-21 depend upon allowable claim 1, the applicants respectfully request that claims 2-21 may now be passed to allowance.

Claim 22 provides a method for interfacing a communication network to a feature server external to the network, which method includes metering, by an SDE, of access of the feature server to the communication network in view of a security level. Nowhere is such metering taught by Frailong. Again, Frailong is merely concerned with the client's interface to a network and merely teaches a controlling of access of the external device to the client's interface, or gateway. Frailong teaches nothing concerning controlling the external device's interface. Therefore, the applicants respectfully submit that Frailong does not teach the limitations of claim 22 and respectfully request that claim 22 may now be passed to allowance.

Since claims 23-38 depend upon allowable claim 22, the applicants respectfully request that claims 23-38 may now be passed to allowance.

As the applicants have overcome all substantive rejections given by the Examiner and has complied with all requests properly presented by the Examiner, the applicants contend that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's rejections of the pending claims. Therefore, the applicants respectfully solicit allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter.

Respectfully submitted,  
Robert Banks et al.

By: 

Steven A. May  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 44,912  
Phone No.: 847/576-3635  
Fax No.: 847/576-3750